



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"And now they nigh approched to the sted
Whereas those Mermayds dwelt: it was a still
And calmy bay, on th'one side sheltered
With the brode shadow of an hoorie hill;
On th'other side an high rocke tourned still,
That twixt them both a pleasaunt port they made,
And did like an halfe Theatre fulfill."

(*F. Q.* II, xii, xxx, 1-7.) The great popularity and influence of the Bible which marked the close of the sixteenth century is reflected in one of Spenser's similes:

"That done he leads him to the highest mount,
Such one as that same mighty man of God,
That blood-red billowes, like a walled front,
On either side disported with his rod,
Till that his army dry-foot through them yod,
Dwelt forty dais upon; where, writt in stone
With bloody letters by the hand of God,
The bitter doome of death and balefull mone
He did receive, whiles flashing fire about him shone:
Or like that sacred hill, whose head full hie,
Adorned with fruitfull Olives all around,
Is, as it were for endlesse memory
Of that deare Lord who oft thereon was fownd,
For even with a flowring girlond crown'd."

(*F. Q.* I, x, liii, 1-9; liv, 1-5.)

Of the remaining similes there are four that show euphustic tendencies (*F. Q.* II, xi, xviii, 1-9; II, xi, xxix, 1-9, and xxx, 1-9; I, xi, viii, 1-9; II, i, xliii, 1-9). The other three are of little importance. One refers to friends (*F. Q.* I, x, lvi, 1-5), another to the loathing of a man for life and his disdain of death (*F. Q.* II, viii, i, 1-9), the third compares King Lear to the useless wick that has burned out in the oil. This though short is one of Spenser's most apt illustrations:

"But true it is that, when the oyle is spent,
The light goes out, and weeke is throwne away:
So, when he had resigned his regiment,
His daughter gan despise his drouping day,
And wearie wax of his continuall stay."

(*F. Q.* II, x, xxx, 1-5.)

FLORENCE EDNA ROWE.

Dallas, Texas.

DUTCH LITERATURE.

Vondel's Lucifer. Translated from the Dutch by LEONARD CHARLES VAN NOPPEN, illustrated by JOHN AARTS. New York and London: Continental Publishing Company, 1898. Holland Society Art Edition limited to 1250 numbered copies. 8vo, pp. 438. Price \$5.

THE author of this translation was born in Holland in 1868. In early childhood he came

to America, and in due time was graduated at Guilford College, N. C., and later at the University of N. C. In 1893 he obtained the degree of A. M. from Haverford College, and left a year later for Holland, where for two years he was engaged in the study of Dutch, and in translating some of the choicest Dutch lyrics into English, among them the choruses in Vondel's *Lucifer*. By the close of his second year in Holland the entire drama had been translated, and the remaining two years before publication were devoted to touching and retouching the more difficult passages.

Mr. Van Noppen's book contains four hundred and thirty-eight pages which are divided into "Translator's Preface" (pp. 13-17); "Introduction" (pp. 19-24) by Prof. Wm. H. Carpenter, of Columbia University; another "Introduction" (pp. 27-38) by Prof. G. Kalf, of the University of Utrecht; "Life and Times of Vondel" (pp. 41-154) by Mr. Van Noppen, who adds "An Interpretation of the *Lucifer*" (pp. 157-224), "A Bibliography of Vondelian Literature" (pp. 227-228), "Edmundson's Parallelisms between Vondel and Milton" (pp. 229-234), "Vondel's Dedication of *Lucifer* to Ferdinand III." (pp. 239-242), "Vondel's Lines on the Portrait of Ferdinand III." (pp. 243-244), and Vondel's "Word to all Fellow-Academicians and Patrons of the Drama" (pp. 245-258), which is really Vondel's Preface. Then follow the "Argument" (pp. 263-264), the "Dramatis Personæ" (p. 265), and last the "*Lucifer*" (pp. 267-438).

Mr. Van Noppen declares at the outset that his version was not made for the purpose of showing Milton's indebtedness to Vondel:

"With the much discussed question of Milton's indebtedness to Vondel this effort has nothing to do. I mention this merely to show that this version was not made that it might be adduced as proof of Vondel's influence on his great English contemporary. It has a much higher reason to commend it; namely, the intrinsic value of the original as a poem and as a national masterpiece. My desire has been to give Vondel; and Vondel is a sufficient justification" ("Preface," p. 15).

Dr. Carpenter reminds us very appropriately in his "Introduction" (p. 22) that:

"It is particularly fitting that such an English translation, both because it is first and because it is Vondel, should be put forth, beyond all other places, from this old Dutch city of New

York. There is surely more than a passing interest in the thought that, at the time of the appearance of Vondel's *Lucifer* in Old Amsterdam, in 1654, its reading public was in part New Amsterdam as well.

The same international note is struck in Dr. Kalff's "Introduction" (p. 37):

"We heartily rejoice over the fact," says Dr. Kalff, who is, perhaps, the greatest Vondelian authority living, "that Vondel's drama has been translated into English by an American for Americans, with whom we Netherlands have from time immemorial been on a friendly footing. . . . Whoever," adds Dr. Kalff, "is in a position, by the comparison of the translation with the original, to form an individual opinion of Van Noppen's work, will probably be convinced, even as I have been, that here an extraordinarily difficult task has been magnificently done."

Dr. Kalff hopes that this translation may draw more closely the bond "between America and that land which at one time possessed the opportunity to be the mother-country." It should be added that Dr. Kalff spent two weeks in going over the manuscript of the translation with Mr. Van Noppen, during the latter's stay in Holland.

The space that the translator gives to the "Life and Times of Vondel," and to the "Interpretation" is, perhaps, justified by the prevalent ignorance in regard to Dutch literature in general, to say nothing of the *Lucifer*, which has never before been translated into English. There has existed hitherto no adequate life of Vondel in English, and not even an English critique of his style that was not influenced more or less by the Milton-Vondel controversy. The best short sketch of his life, outside of Dutch sources, is found in volume 44 of Michaud's *Biographie Universelle*. One paragraph deserves to be quoted as showing with admirable precision and perspective the place in Dutch letters that Vondel filled:

"Bien qu'à la renaissance des lettres la Hollande ne demeurât point plongée dans un honteux sommeil, bien que l'affranchissement du peuple batave dût éveiller les esprits dans son sein et aiguillonner le génie, bien que des hommes d'un mérite supérieur ne tardassent pas à s'y occuper d'une littérature nationale, et qu'ils eussent déjà déployé de généreux efforts dans cette honorable carrière, il manquait un point central pour diriger la commune tendance vers le but d'une noble émulation; il fallait un de ces hommes rares qui, secouant les

entraves, savent s'élever au-dessus de la commune portée et devenir le coryphée du Parnasse hollandais: cet homme fut Vondel."

Mr. Van Noppen's treatment of the life and times of Vondel evinces thorough familiarity with his subject and is written *con amore*; but the note of laudation so uniformly held will probably beget a somewhat insurrectionary feeling in the minds of many readers, while the profusion of metaphor inwrought into his style tends to rob his sentences of that critical exactness and sense of clear vision that they would otherwise have.

In his "Interpretation" the translator takes the common-sense view of the *Lucifer* that was ably defended by Cramer in the *Inleiding* to his edition of the *Lucifer* of 1891. Both critics rehearse only to reject the various political interpretations that have from time to time been put upon Vondel's drama. Cramer deems most plausible of these erroneous interpretations the one that identifies Lucifer in the main with Wallenstein, while Mr. Van Noppen finds a greater show of probability in the contention that Lucifer represents Cromwell. But Cramer sees in the drama not the strife of political parties, but a picture of the eternal warfare of good with evil, of truth with lies:

"Zoo kwam de dichter bij zijn belangstellend waarnemen der grootsche worstelingen, waar ook zijn tijd vol van was, tot de wetenschap, dat de wereldhistorie niet is, dan het zich eeuwig verjongend schouwspel van den mensch, die in zijn trots zich tegen God verzet, m. a. w., van den strijd tusschen waarheid en logen."

And Mr. Van Noppen voices the same conclusion when he says that,

"The *Lucifer* represents the gigantic and eternal battle of evil with good, with the universe as the battlefield;"

but when he adds that,

"Furthermore, the tragedy typifies the character of the Hollanders themselves, . . . a nation that has ever been in revolt, not only against man, but ever against the sublime forces of nature, a race that has never known defeat,"

and that,

"Like *Faust*, the *Lucifer* is 'ever more a striving towards the highest existence,' " the interpretation seems to us strained and even verging on self-contradiction.

We may add that Vondel himself gave the supposed cue to a political interpretation of his drama, by declaring in 1658 (in *Apollo's Harp*) that the English people might find food for thought ("stichtelijke Leer") in the *Lucifer*. The thrust was plainly at Cromwell and his Puritan followers; for Vondel, having gone over to the Roman Catholics in 1641, had more than once expressed his detestation of the Roundheads. It remained, however, for the critics of this century to carry to an extreme, if not utterly to misconstrue, the comment of Vondel on his own poem.

In 1844 Van Lennep, in his lectures on Vondel, gave wide currency to the view that the *Lucifer* was meant to represent the uprising of the Netherlanders against Philip II. of Spain, Lucifer typifying William of Orange. Independently of Van Lennep, the same conclusion was reached by Dr. Jonckbloet in his *Vondel's Lucifer: een politieke allegorie* (published in 1849 in the *Overijsselsche Almanak*). This view was combated by Beets in 1864. The battle was then on, and has raged ever since. A list of some of the leading contestants may be found in Van Lennep's *Vondel, 1654-1655* (p. 5), which constitutes volume seventeen of his edition of Vondel's complete works. This edition first appeared in 1855-'69, but has been re-edited by Unger, the author of the well-known *Bibliographie van Vondel's Werken* (1888).

On page 227, in his "Bibliography," Mr. Van Noppen has this entry: "VONDEL AND MILTON. August Müller, 1864"; and following it, "ÜBER [it should be ÜBER] MILTON'S ABHÄNGIGKEIT VON VONDEL. Berlin, 1891." There is no such book as that first named, for Müller was born in 1864; but Müller's name should be added to the second.

It is an interesting bibliographical fact, which we gather from Unger's *Bibliographie*, that no new edition of the *Lucifer* appeared throughout the whole of the eighteenth century. The nineteenth century, however, has witnessed about twenty-five editions. The first edition was that printed by Abraham de Wees, Amsterdam, 1654.

In regard to Edmundson's so-called "Parallelisms," while they will facilitate comparison between the *Lucifer* and *Paradise Lost*,

and thus save time and trouble to the student of comparative literature, we believe that the question of Milton's alleged indebtedness to Vondel is not thus hastily to be settled. The only scientific method would be to examine first the sources from which both poets drew in common, then to compare the overlappings of each. By failing to do this Edmundson has vitiated his entire treatment of the controversy. The last ten years, moreover, have witnessed notable additions to the material given in Todd's *Conspectus*. For example, Vondel himself says (Van Noppen's edition, p. 254),

"Among the English Protestants, the learned pen of Richard Baker hath discoursed very freely in prose concerning Lucifer and all the acts of the rebellious Spirits."

Vondel is here enumerating his own sources. And Bishop Avitus, of Vienne (c. 450-525 A. D.), is now known to have written a poem in five acts with which both Milton and Vondel would seem to have been familiar. See "A Precursor of Milton" (unsigned) in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 65, Jan., 1890:

"It is incomprehensible," says this contributor, commenting on Avitus's poem, "that in all which had hitherto been written [that is, before the appearance of Edmundson's 'Parallelisms' in 1885] about Milton and his borrowing, Vondel should practically have been overlooked; but it is still more strange that nobody has yet named the original source whence the poets of the seventeenth century drew, who sang the revolt of the angels or the fall of man,—a source to which Vondel owed more than any of them."

Baker's prose works, therefore, and Avitus's poem, to neither of which the Milton-Vondel jury has yet had access, must be thoroughly examined before any attempt is made to pass judgment on the interrelations of the two great masterpieces so summarily appraised by Edmundson. It must be remembered, too, that Vondel wrote in rimed Alexandrines, which Mr. Van Noppen translates into blank verse, the verse of Milton. Unless the reader, therefore, is on his guard, the metrical resemblance will unduly enhance the resemblance of content.

Before dismissing the question of parallelisms, not in itself important, we desire to mention a few fundamental divergences of treatment in the two poems, divergences that

must effectually bar any attempt to detract materially from the originality of Milton's work by comparison with that of his Dutch contemporary: (1) The *Lucifer* is a drama, constructed rigidly on the Greek model—a fact that differentiates *in toto* its style and method of progression from the epic scope and leisurely movement of *Paradise Lost*. (2) There is a wide difference between the two poems in the sphere and characterization of the various rebel leaders. (3) The *motif* of the action in the two poems could hardly be more unlike: Milton represents the rebellion of the angels as taking place before the creation of man; Satan rebelled because, and as soon as, God proclaimed His Son Ruler over all the heavenly hierarchies (Bk. v.); Adam and Eve were then created for the purpose of filling the void left by the fallen angels. But with Vondel, the angels rebel because man has already been created, and because the prophecy of Christ's Incarnation in human form has been made. Lucifer considers this unworthy of the Godhead:

"The majesty
Of God and of the Godhead is debased,
If with the blood of man his nature ever
Unites, combines, or otherwise is bound,"
(Van Noppen's ed. ii, 222-225.)

Vondel, therefore, must have believed that the Incarnation would have taken place even had Adam not sinned. In revenge for his defeat, Lucifer sends Belial to earth, who brings about man's first disobedience. (4) *Paradise Lost* is, above all, a learned poem, Milton having announced publicly in 1641 his intention of writing a poem requiring "industrious and select reading." Instead of the incessant demand made by *Paradise Lost* upon the reader's knowledge of history, geography, theology, astronomy, and mythology, we find in the *Lucifer* not even the need of a footnote from beginning to end.

Many minor differences will occur to every reader of Mr. Van Noppen's excellent version. For example, Vondel represents Apollion as thus describing to Lucifer Adam's sovereignty over the beasts of the field:

"The mountain-lion wagged his tail and smiled
Upon his lord. And, at his sovereign's feet,
The tiger, too, his fierceness laid. The bull
Bowed low his horns; the elephant, his trunk.
The bear forgot his rage."

(i, 107-111.)

But before the fall had the tiger developed any "fierceness," the lion any "rage"? Did not the lion and the lamb lie down together (the lamb *not* inside the lion)? Milton has his menagerie better in hand. Speaking in his own person he says,

"About them frisking played
All beasts of the earth, *since wild*,"
(iv, 340-41.)

As to Mr. Van Noppen's translation of the *Lucifer*, we believe that Dr. Kalf's words of commendation already quoted are no more than just. The work evinces not only a mastery of seventeenth century Dutch but an insight into metrical effects, and facility in reproducing them in English. This version could not have come from one who had not drilled himself for years in the theory and practice of English verse. Space will permit the quotation of only a few lines. When Belzebub asks Apollion "of the twain thou sawest" on the earth, Apollion thus replies:

"No creature hath on high mine eye so pleased
As those below. Who could so subtly soul
With body weave and two-fold Angels form
From clay and bone? The body's shapely mould
Attests the Maker's art, that, in the face,
The mirror of the mind, doth best appear.
But wonderful! upon the face is stamped
The image of the soul. All beauty here
Concentres, while a god looks through the eyes.
Above the whole the reasoning soul doth hover,
And while the dumb and brutish beasts all look
Down towards their feet, man proudly lifts alone
His head to Heaven, in lofty praise to God."

(i, 123-125.)

Occasionally the translator introduces certain expansions into his version which, while not marring the original meaning, serve to give us inaccurate impressions as to Vondel's style. Thus, "den zilvren dau"—"the *sparkling* silvery dew"; "dit loof"—"those *radiant* leaves"; "op mijn pennen"—"on *floating* pinions." Sometimes one line of Vondel is expanded into two:

"Aen d'een zy flaeuwe hoop; aen d'andre gooter schrick"—
"On the one side flicker feeble rays of hope,
While on the other yawns a flaming horror."

(iv, 386-87.)

But that these double-line expansions are comparatively rare is attested by the fact that Vondel's nineteen hundred and sixty-two Alexandrines are represented by only two thousand four hundred and ninety lines of blank verse.

The translations of the choruses preserve every detail of the original meter. We do not think that any succeeding translator is likely to improve materially Mr. Van Noppen's version of these difficult portions of the *Lucifer*. Involved in style and intricate in form as many of these Dutch strophes and anti strophes are, the translator has yet preserved meaning and meter so skilfully, and blended with them so fine a lyric grace, that his work nowhere suggests the merely mechanical, and nowhere evinces the lifeless mimicry that so often accompanies the attempt to reproduce original meters.

We bespeak for the handsome volume before us a wide circulation. That such a translation has been sorely needed, every student of comparative literature knows. That this need has been adequately met every impartial student of Mr. Van Noppen's version will, we believe, readily admit.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

Louisiana State University.

KLUGE AND LUTZ, ENGLISH ETYMOLOGY.

English Etymology, a select glossary serving as an Introduction to the History of the English Language, by FRIEDRICH KLUGE and FREDERICK LUTZ. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. viii+234.

THIS little work, the general reliability of which is vouched for by the name of Kluge, is not intended to supplant Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*, but "is meant to serve as an introduction to the study of the historical grammar of English." The book is, therefore, in place and needs no apology for its appearance. For in Skeat, as the authors say,

"the linguistic laws underlying the various changes of form and meaning are not brought out clearly enough to be easily grasped by the uninitiated."

In *English Etymology*, therefore, are included "loan-words of Scandinavian, French and Latin origin, and such genuine English words as may afford matter for linguistic investigation."

But let not the uninitiated imagine that in this work the phonetic laws are clearly explained. That could not be expected. The

place for that is in comparative grammars. And yet it could be wished and expected that we might not find phonetic improbabilities or impossibilities. For in a work so sponsored these must necessarily cause confusion.

To begin with, the palatals, pure velars, and labio-velars ought to be kept distinct. But the same character is used to represent the IE. (or Aryan, as it is here called) palatal and the pure velar, and, in some cases, the three series of gutturals. How are the uninitiated to distinguish between the IE. palatal *tenuis* and the pure velar *tenuis* if both are given as *k*, or how is he to judge of the palatal, the pure velar, and the labio-velar media if all appear as *g*? This confusion is seen not only in the use of the characters but also in the etymological connections made. For example, E. *herd* is referred to an Aryan *kerdhā*, which is said to be connected with Skt. *śārdha-s* 'troop,' with IE. *k̑*; and with OSlav. *črěda* 'herd,' Lith. *keŗdžus* 'shepherd.' with IE. *g*, the pure velar. Now there are cases of such confusion (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I, 545 f.), and if this is one of them it should have been so explained. But it is more probable that the confusion here is of recent origin, due to Kluge and Lutz.

It is a pity also to find so many cases of supposed interchange between the labio-velar and the labial series. Mere similarity in meaning is no ground for making such connections. Let us examine the list to see whether they may not be explained otherwise. E. *creep*, OE. *crēopan*, etc., are referred to a Germ. root *krūp*, *krūq*, on account of the synonymous OHG. *kriohhan*. It is true we have here the roots *krūp*, *krūq*, but they are not necessarily the same. They probably are related through a pre-Germ. root *grū-*, but beyond that we have no right to go. E. *creep* may be further connected with OE. *cryppan* 'bend, crook' (finger), *criēpan* 'contract, clench' (hand), and perhaps *crump*, *crumb*, Gk. *γρῦνός* 'bent.' Cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s.v. *krumm*; Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s.v. *γρῦνός*.—E. *draff*: *dregs*. Comparison is made here with Lat. *fracēs*, which does not contain the labio-velar *q̑*. Cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I, 369. E. *draff* may be referred to Goth. *drōbjan*. Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s.v. *drōbjan*. Here *b* certainly does not go back